		1			
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA				
2	BEFORE THE HONORABLE LARRY R. HICKS, DISTRICT JUDGE				
3					
4	ORACLE USA, INC., a Colorado : corporation; ORACLE AMERICA, :				
5	INC., a Delaware corporation; : and ORACLE INTERNATIONAL : No. 2:10-cv-0106-LRH-PAL				
6	CORPORATION, a California : corporation, :				
7	: Plaintiffs, :				
8	vs. :				
9	RIMINI STREET, INC., a Nevada :				
10	corporation; and SETH RAVIN, : an individual, :				
11	Defendants.				
12	:				
13					
14	TRANSCRIPT OF STATUS CONFERENCE				
15	May 27, 2015				
16	May 27, 2013				
17	Reno, Nevada				
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24	Court Reporter: Donna Davidson, RDR, CRR, CCR 318 Certified Realtime Reporter				
25	400 South Virginia Street Reno, Nevada 89501 (775) 329-0132				

```
2
1
                          APPEARANCES
2
      FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:
3
      KIERAN RINGGENBERG
      Boies, Schiller & Flexner LLP
 4
      1999 Harrison Street
      Oakland, California 94612
5
      (510) 874-1000
 6
      Fax: (510) 874-1460
      kringgenberg@bsfllp.com
7
      RICHARD J. POCKER
8
      Boies, Schiller & Flexner LLP
      300 South Fourth Street
 9
      Suite 800
      Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
      (702) 382-7300
10
      Fax: (702) 382-2755
11
      rpocker@bsfllp.com
12
      WILLIAM A. ISAACSON
      KAREN L. DUNN
13
      Boies, Schiller & Flexner LLP
      5301 Wisconsin Avenue NW
      Washington, DC 20015
14
      (202) 237-2727
15
      THOMAS S. HIXSON
16
      NITIN JINDAL
     Morgan Lewis & Bockius LLP
17
      One Market Spear Street Tower
      San Francisco, California 94105
18
      (415) 442-1000
      thomas.hixson@morganlewis.com
19
      nitin.jindal@morganlewis.com
20
      JAMES C. MAROULIS (By telephone)
      Oracle Corporation
21
      500 Oracle Parkway
      Redwood City, California 94070
22
      (650) 506-4846
      jim.maroulis@oracle.com
23
24
25
```

```
3
1
                 A P P E A R A N C E S (Continued)
2
      FOR THE DEFENDANTS:
3
      PETER STRAND (By telephone)
      B. TRENT WEBB
 4
      Shook, Hardy & Bacon L.L.P.
      2555 Grand Boulevard
5
      Kansas City, Missouri 64108
      (816) 474-6550
 6
      Fax: (816) 421-5547
7
      pstrand@shb.com
      bwebb@shb.com
8
      ROBERT H. RECKERS (By telephone)
      Shook, Hardy & Bacon LLP
9
      600 Travis Street
      Suite 3400
10
      Houston, Texas 77002
11
      (713) 227-8008
      Fax: (713) 227-9508
12
      rreckers@shb.com
13
      W. WEST ALLEN
14
      Lewis Roca Rothgerber LLP
      3993 Howard Hughes Parkway
      Suite 600
15
      Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
16
      (702) 949-8230
      Fax: (702) 949-8364
17
      wallen@lrrlaw.com
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
                 RENO, NEVADA, MAY 27, 2015, 1:30 P.M.
2
                                --000--
                        PROCEEDINGS
3
 5
                THE COURT: Good afternoon. Have a seat,
 6
     please.
7
                COURTROOM ADMINISTRATOR: Today is the date and
8
     time for status conference in civil case
     2:10-cv-106-LRH-PAL, Oracle USA, Inc., and others, versus
 9
10
     Rimini Street, Inc., and others.
11
                Counsel in the courtroom, can you please state
12
     your appearances for the record.
13
                MR. ISSACSON: Bill Issacson, Your Honor, Boies,
14
     Schiller & Flexner, for the Oracle plaintiffs.
15
                THE COURT: All right. You can remain at
16
     counsel table. You don't have to make the trek up to the
17
     podium.
18
                MS. DUNN: Karen Dunn, of Boies, Schiller &
     Flexner, also for the plaintiffs.
19
20
                MR. HIXSON: Your Honor, Tom Hixson, with
21
     Morgan, Lewis, also for plaintiffs.
22
                MR. RINGGENBERG: Kiernan Ringgenberg, Boies,
23
     Schiller, for the plaintiffs.
24
                MR. POCKER: Your Honor, Richard Pocker, also
25
     with Boies, Schiller, for the plaintiffs.
```

1 THE COURT: And welcome to all of you. 2 MR. WEBB: Good afternoon, Judge. Trent Webb, with Shook, Hardy & Bacon, for the defendants. 3 MR. ALLEN: And West Allen, with Lewis Roca 5 Rothgerber, for defendants. THE COURT: All right. Well, I welcome you to 6 7 the courtroom as well. This is our first court hearing on 8 this case for as much as it's been -- oh, let's cover the 9 telephonic before we deal with the in-persons. 10 MR. MAROULIS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This 11 is James Maroulis, from Oracle, for plaintiffs. 12 MR. JADAL: Good afternoon. This is Nitin 13 Jadal, from Morgan Lewis & Bockius, for plaintiffs. 14 MR. STRAND: Good afternoon, Your Honor. name is Peter Strand. I'm with Shook, Hardy & Bacon. 15 16 representing the defendants. 17 MR. RECKERS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 18 is Robert Reckers, Shook, Hardy & Bacon, also for the 19 defendants. 20 THE COURT: Anyone else by telephone? 21 All right. Apparently not. 22 Well, getting back to where I was, this is our 23 first hearing on this case, in spite of the fact that I 24 have no idea how many hours have been spent on this case, 25 certainly by those attending in the courtroom, an

- 1 incredible amount of hours in chambers as well with us.
- 2 But I know you spent time with Judge Leen. And I've been
- 3 in touch with her.
- But in any event, as you know, I issued an order
- 5 | a week and a half ago outlining our trial schedule, as I
- 6 saw it, coming up in Las Vegas and also raising the thought
- 7 | that the trial would probably move along much more quickly,
- 8 or significantly more quickly, were it moved up to Reno,
- 9 allowing more trial time.
- So I -- that's why we're here. So let's address
- 11 | that first. Let me hear from Oracle with regard to their
- 12 thoughts.
- MR. ISSACSON: Your Honor, Bill Issacson. And
- 14 technically my -- along with Karen Dunn, my pro hac vice
- 15 motion is still pending.
- But we think of this as primarily an issue
- 17 between -- with the Court and the defendants. We're happy
- 18 to come to trial here. And we are particularly happy to
- 19 have a trial that moves along more expeditiously and a
- 20 | place where there's more time for trial. But so we have no
- 21 reservations about having a trial here.
- 22 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
- On behalf of defendant?
- MR. WEBB: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is
- 25 | Trent Webb. I'm with Shook, Hardy & Bacon.

As modified, the Las Vegas schedule for the defendants works great. Starting at noon on Monday, to allow the Court and the court staff a more convenient way to get to Las Vegas, works for us. And as a matter of fact, if there are other modifications to the schedule, as currently outlined, in Las Vegas that makes sense for the Court and the court staff, we'd be more than happy to entertain that.

But for the following reasons, we really believe that this trial should take place in Las Vegas. And chief among those reasons, Your Honor, is the named defendant, Seth Ravin.

Mr. Ravin, as Your Honor is aware, has some serious health issues, and they're fairly complicated, the details of which I can't really get into in open court, but we would be happy to provide additional details for Your Honor if you believe that's to be necessary. But for this afternoon, suffice it to say they're complicated and serious.

The problem is that not all healthcare facilities are created equal, and not all doctors are created equal. Mr. Ravin has a long history of treatment and a voluminous medical record. He's very comfortable with his existing physicians. Going to a new place with strange facilities and unknown doctors creates issues for

him and frankly for anyone in his position.

And couple that with being a named defendant in a trial where the plaintiffs are seeking hundreds of millions of dollars, and the very existence of his company hanging in the balance, the combined effect of him going to a strange and unknown treatment facility to take care of his very serious issues at the same time he's spending every day in court, I'm afraid creates a very stressful environment, the results of which could be fairly serious.

So for that reason alone, even though certainly we are cognizant of the convenience issues for the Court -- and going all the way to Vegas to try this case I'm sure is not easy for you, your staff. And we wish there was a solution that worked for everyone.

But, unfortunately, just given Mr. Ravin's unique medical situation and his prominent role in this trial and the future of which really depends on his existence in the company and personal wealth, I think that militates strongly in favor of keeping it in Vegas.

In addition to that -- again, we think that is probably the most important and probably significant reason to keep it in Vegas. In addition, Rimini's already made some investment in preparing a trial site for the trial team in the building that they currently have it for their business. What they've done is they've built out a

significant part of an entire floor to house the trial team during this long trial.

If we were to move and have trial here, that investment would be wasted, at least until such time as they put employees there. They would also have to make a duplicate investment somewhere here to find trial space for the team for this long trial. And for that reason, that double expense makes it a hardship on a company the size of Rimini Street.

A third reason, Your Honor, witness travel. The flights to and out of Reno are certainly less frequent than Las Vegas. And there are no nonstops between the cities where counsel and our witnesses are located and Reno. And that becomes somewhat of a problem.

For example, even today, Mr. Reckers was planning to attend in person. Due to the floods in Houston he missed his flight and there were no other options to get here. Similarly, one of my clients, Jack Reilly, also had problems getting here.

And, again, that is not dispositive. I mean, there are places that are tough to get to. But weighing the differences between Las Vegas and Reno, we certainly think that's at least something that's relevant.

In particular, some of our staff had planned to go home on the weekends, or at least one weekend, to see

1 their family. From Vegas there's a convenient flight to 2 get them home at 7:00 on Friday night. That's not available here. So that may or may not allow that to 3 happen. 5 And, again, in the broad spectrum of things, Your Honor, that's not a big deal. But when you have staff 6 7 with little kids at home, that is a fairly big deal to 8 them. So that's another reason why we would like to keep 9 it in Vegas. And I could go on, Your Honor, if you would 10 11 like, or answer your questions. I have additional reasons. 12 But I don't know if I need to cover all of those. 13 THE COURT: No. Obviously I anticipated that 14 that might be your response. And I -- I don't have a 15 problem with that. It also occurred to me in issuing that order 16 17

It also occurred to me in issuing that order that it could be that everyone would be of the mind that moving the trial along more quickly was paramount. But I respect that if you don't. And I'll leave it in Las Vegas.

MR. WEBB: Thank you, Your Honor.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: But I -- and you don't have any problem with that modified schedule that we included in the order; is that right?

MR. WEBB: Absolutely not, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Does Oracle have any

problem at all with the schedule that's been outlined for
las Vegas?

MR. ISSACSON: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Well, it did occur to me -- and what prompted all of this was that I had a lot of trial time in Las Vegas in the last several months, and I just realized that with a two- or three-day trial we can accommodate coming in on a Sunday evening and leaving at the end of the week. But with a lengthy trial like this, obviously we can't.

But it did occur to me as I looked at the daytime schedules -- I had hoped not to end promptly at 2:00 in the afternoon, but I also know in dealing with the jury that that's a lot of trial time for jurors. So we may see some tweaking to accommodate jurors more than anything else. But right now we'll stick with the plan.

MR. WEBB: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Are there any other issues that -- well, let me ask counsel on the phone.

Counsel, those of you who are attending by phone, is there anything that you would wish to add or raise further with regard to this accommodation question?

MR. MAROULIS: This is James Maroulis for Oracle. No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Well, that

will be the plan. I'll confirm the trial in Las Vegas on the schedule that's been posted in my order in document number 552. There may be some minor tweaking to that schedule, depending on how we move along. But essentially that's what -- that's what will be the plan.

Are there any other matters that you would -- I feel a little guilty seeing that everyone's traveled up here just for this hearing. Maybe it's a little bit of payback. But there may be something that someone would like to raise.

MR. ISSACSON: I can -- no issues for you to -- certainly to decide today. We can bring you up to date on a few things.

One question we did have in terms of the mid-week schedule from 8:00 to 2:00 or later. What would be the Court's -- is there a pattern you have for breaks during that 8:00 to 2:00 --

THE COURT: Well, actually my normal trial schedule is 8:30 in the morning until 5:30 or 5:15 in the evening. But because of the medical issue concerning Mr. Ravin, I thought I'd use the concentrated approach that some of my fellow judges use, which is basically an 8:00 to 2:00 schedule without a lunch break. And what it is is a snack break midway through the day. And that's probably what we will be doing.

1 MR. ISSACSON: Okav. That's what -- that's the 2 way we were reading it. But I just wanted to make sure. THE COURT: All right. 3 The -- in terms of the business MR. ISSACSON: that the parties have been doing, defendant says he will 5 have seen and filed two motions in limine. We've initiated 6 7 a process of meeting and conferring with the defendants on 8 a global list of motions in limine from both sides and with 9 the hopes of perhaps some of these can be resolved, unlikely many of them can't, and then to agree on a 10 11 briefing schedule so that many of these motions which are 12 worth resolving earlier than the ordinary schedule of 10 13 days before trial --14 THE COURT: 30. 15 MR. ISSACSON: Right. But I recognize that you may --16 THE COURT: 30. 17 and I encourage if you know you have a limine, if you know 18 you can't resolve it between you and it needs to be filed 19 and briefed and heard by the Court, I encourage you -- and there's no reply on limines, as you know. There'll be 20 21 points and authorities opening it up and an appropriate 22 response, and we'll get to it. 23 But I strongly encourage moving those along. 24 I'm sure there's going to be a number. And we need time

25

for them too.

MR. ISSACSON: Right. So we're going to meet and confer with the other side and we're going to talk about page limits. And then I believe we're talking about a briefing schedule that might end by late July or early August, something like that. And we'll work it out with the other side and present it to you.

And then the other issue before trial would be the issue of jury instructions, and specifically the issue of the licenses. Your Honor will recall that your summary judgment rulings dealt with certain licenses and that there are other licenses in the case. And so -- and Your Honor will recall that you've been informed we would meet and confer about possibly how to streamline the trial with respect to those license issues, potentially through jury instructions.

And we have met and conferred and been unable to resolve differences on this. So Oracle will be filing a motion asking the Court to consider those issues before trial -- in advance of trial, in advance of when you would ordinarily decide most of the jury instruction issues. And we'll be filing that I think as early as today and suggesting to the Court that -- and we'll confer with them about a briefing schedule for that, but suggesting to the -- it will assist in the preparation for the trial and moving the trial along if we can know where we stand on

various legal issues as to the interpretation of the licenses.

THE COURT: I appreciate your doing that, obviously. And your commenting on it reminded me I should have reviewed the entirety of the pretrial order before I came in because I don't recall what I said with regard to timing on proposed jury instructions.

But the instructions are so sensitive in a case like this, the earlier you can get them in and -- well, first of all, let me say this. I really hope that you can agree upon the large bulk of instructions. I recognize there's going to be some where there will be disagreement. But I certainly encourage, recognizing all the -- all the issues that are present in this case, that counsel are working on those instructions early or attempting to resolve them to every possible extent that you can.

And if you can't resolve them, I need to see why they're not being resolved. I need the authorities in support of each party's position; I need each party's proposed instruction, if there's not agreement on a certain issue; and I need those probably earlier than what my pretrial order says.

MR. ISSACSON: All right. We will talk to the other side also about the global -- all the pretrial instructions -- all the jury instructions and certainly

will endeavor to agree on, you know, the most common ones that the Court would give.

And then I did have a question then about jury selection if you've got any -- anything that you would say to the lawyers beforehand about how you typically handle jury selection?

THE COURT: Yeah. My jury selection process is essentially all voir dire is framed by the Court. So I will take requested voir dire questions. I usually find that they're broader and in more detail than is necessary. And I'll attempt to work through everything that I feel that's been raised as an issue in the proposed questions.

encourage you to frame broader questions rather than narrower ones because my experience is that when you have jurors in the box they have had so little exposure, particularly to patent-related cases, copyright-related cases, IT cases that just general subject matters that would catch the juror's attention and likely give them something to respond on is the more effective way of moving through the voir dire than trying to go through the specific detailed questions that I sometimes receive from either side.

But I will ask the questions. I will attempt to cover every subject matter that I feel is appropriate

that's been raised in the requested questions. I'll use some of those questions -- I like the ones that are broader rather than narrower.

I do not like to ask jurors about what are your feelings about this concept or that concept because that invites having to go through it with every juror and tends to make jurors uncomfortable. And the first jurors you direct those kinds of questions to usually feel like they've been put on the spot somehow.

So it's not a comfortable process. And I don't like to use those kind of questions. I like to use tighter questions, "Have you ever worked in an IT department? Raise your hand." Or worked on -- how many of you are involved with anything that has to do with da, da, da. And I'll go through each one, see what they have to say. I find that works very well in jury selection.

And I will also confer with counsel at sidebar or when the jury's excused, either during the breaks -- we'll have to establish that break schedule because, as I've said, that's not my normal trial schedule.

But in any event, I will meet with counsel -I'll meet at sidebar if -- probably in most cases. And if
you have further questions that you'd like to have asked
individual jurors or to the jury in general, I'll consider
those.

And it seems like I've had, from my view, good success doing it that way. I haven't had a problem, even on the more technical cases.

And, of course, I will allow counsel to make a record on anything they're not happy with. I take no insult at that. I just don't want to waste time doing it.

MR. ISSACSON: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Webb?

MR. WEBB: Just one last thing. Just for clarity, Judge. Our understanding, I believe it's Oracle's understanding, as well, that if we have an evidentiary issue or an important dispute that we need resolution on early, we should go ahead and file those, alert Your Honor to the fact that these are important and need to be ruled upon before we do our typical motions in limine that, hopefully we can agree on them but in the unlikely event we can't, we'll file those at a later time.

And by filing them early, we're not tolling the decision, we're highlighting the importance so Your Honor can make a decision relatively early. Is that the --

THE COURT: Well, I approve of that. I approve of every bit of heads-up that you can give the Court. And I can tell you that we will be working on that from the get-go. I approve of that without question.

Coming back to trial and trial process, I do not like to break up jury time for legal arguments. I am very juror oriented. My view is you -- a trial judge's principal role is to streamline the evidence for the jury. Not that that's the Court's role, but I'm talking about the trial process.

MR. WEBB: Sure.

THE COURT: So I'm loathe to excuse the jury for a legal argument that could be raised in the morning before we get started, in the evening after we've shut down, or during some break during the case, particularly if it's not going to unnecessarily extend the break.

So I am not a judge who wants an objection raised with an expectation that I'm going to excuse the jury while it be argued. I don't like to do that. I don't like legal arguments being presented in front of the jury either.

So my approach to that is to encourage any dispute or conflict that's coming up over an issue to be identified to me ahead of time, particularly during trial, and we'll set a time to address it without wasting juror time.

MR. WEBB: Understood, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ISSACSON: I guess one last question, Your

Honor. And perhaps it can't be answered today. The parties have obviously expressed different opinions about the length of the trial. And maybe your rulings before trial will have some effect on that. But I don't know if there's going to become a point where you'll be accessing the case and set any time limits on the trial.

We've obviously taken the view that this trial should be done in three weeks or less, and we think the plaintiffs can put on a case that's consistent with that.

But I don't know what the Court's -- if the Court has a view as to how it's going to approach these issues as we move forward.

THE COURT: I haven't found that it was necessary to put time caps or time period caps on either trials or portions of a case, for example, opening or closing statements or anything else.

But I would consider doing it. Because I'm -obviously with a case like this, where we have some -- such
a volume as we have, it could be that this would be the
case where I would feel that's appropriate. So I'm just
going to leave it open. I would obviously let anyone know
when we're headed that way.

Essentially Oracle's estimated three weeks;
Rimini's five to seven. I have a hard time imagining how
this case should go seven weeks, I'll tell you that right

now. It looks to me like it's somewhere between three to four weeks, and just my rough assessment based on what I know about the case.

But another point I would make relative to trial is that when the issue of evidence is not authenticity, in other words, the record, the issue, the testimony, whatever it is, is undeniably authentic, the question usually just becomes a ruling on the law of evidence or a ruling on relevancy or, in some cases, 403 rulings where you're just dealing with cumulative evidence or evidence that is not essential to the case.

I like to see counsel to be able to stipulate to authenticity, and then I'll hear the legal arguments and I'll hear those as we move through the case, usually at times outside the presence of the jury, before they've started or after they've gone home. And I'll certainly attempt -- it's clear to me we need -- we will be having some hearings on this case between now and trial time, depending on when these motions and so forth are presented. But that's how I view it.

MR. ISSACSON: All right. Thank you. And obviously the lawsuit involves two businesses, so hopefully we'll have discussions about stipulations about business records as well as authenticity.

THE COURT: Yeah. You know, and I would say too

I appreciate the quality of counsel that I've seen in this case on both sides. But I think you know, and it's certainly my observation from the bench, that the finer points of evidentiary objections and foundational questions for admission of records and everything else, when authenticity is not at issue, can frustrate a jury faster than anything I've seen in litigation practice. It's damaging to whichever party is identified as being responsible for that when it becomes excessive.

And, you know, I think I'm a fair judge. I try and give everyone their fair presentation of the evidence. But it's hard to hold back on that frustration when you see someone who is stretching a case out more than it needs to be stretched out.

But -- and if anyone feels that I am showing my frustration at an inappropriate time, I take no offense at being reminded either. But my view is we get these trials in, we have certain issues that are obviously tantamount to the parties. Those need to be presented. The evidence needs to go to them. The jury needs to be tracking with all of that without anyone getting sidetracked. And that's what I hope I can say has happened at the end of a trial.

MR. ISSACSON: Thank you, Your Honor. That's helpful.

THE COURT: All right. Yes?

```
1
                MR. WEBB: Nothing further from the defendants,
2
     Your Honor. Thank you.
                THE COURT: All right. Is there anything
3
     further from any of our counsel appearing by telephone?
 5
                MR. MAROULIS: This is James Maroulis, Your
 6
     Honor, for the plaintiffs.
                                 No.
 7
                THE COURT: All right.
8
                MR. STRAND: Peter Strand for the defendants.
     Nothing from this side either, Your Honor.
 9
10
                THE COURT: All right. Well, I appreciate
11
     everyone's attention. I -- you do have a settlement
12
     conference coming up on this sometime soon, don't you?
13
                MR. WEBB: Next week, Your Honor.
14
                THE COURT: I'm going to wish you luck on that.
15
     Judge Leen reminded me that was coming up. But, again, you
16
     know, from what I've seen of these cases, they are better
17
     settled than litigated. Look how long this case has taken
18
     already and how much longer it's likely to go if you go to
19
     trial and someone gets burned one way or the other. We're
     looking at appeals that go on ad nauseam. So I strongly
20
21
     urge very serious attempt at settlement.
22
                But all of that stated, I'll bid you ado.
23
     pleasant flights back to wherever you're flying back to.
24
     hope you are able to make connections. And we'll try this
25
     case in Las Vegas.
```

```
24
1
                 Court is adjourned.
2
                 COURTROOM ADMINISTRATOR: Please rise.
3
             (The proceedings concluded at 2:00 p.m.)
 4
5
 6
7
8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

			25
1	-000-		
2	I certify that the foregoing is a cor	rect	
3	transcript from the record of proceed	lings	
4	in the above-entitled matter.		
5			
6	Donna Davidson	6/8/15	
7	Donna Davidson, RDR, CRR, CCR #318 Official Reporter	Date	
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			